

HOUSING SATISFACTION
AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

by

MELANIE ROWE STOCKDELL

B.A., University of Colorado, 1975

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family Economics

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1979

Approved by:


Major Professor

Spec. Coll.
LD
2668
.T4
1979
SF35
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
Chapter	
One. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Two. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	3
Housing Norms.....	3
Current University Housing Problems.....	5
Satisfaction with Housing: The Influence of Housing Characteristics.....	7
Satisfaction with Housing: The Influence of Demographic Characteristics.....	10
Three. METHODOLOGY.....	13
Research Questions.....	13
Instrument.....	13
Administration of the Questionnaire.....	15
The Sample.....	15
Measurement of Variables.....	16
Measures of Satisfaction.....	18
Analysis of the Data.....	19
Four. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE.....	20
Demographic Characteristics.....	20
Housing Characteristics.....	22
Five. HOUSING SATISFACTION.....	29
Space.....	29
Quality.....	34
Location.....	35
Housing Expenditure.....	38
Maintenance.....	43
Parking.....	43
Landlord Relationship.....	46
Total Housing Satisfaction.....	49
Regression Models for Total Housing Satisfaction.....	53

Six. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS.....	63
Summary.....	63
Policy Implications.....	65
Conclusions.....	67
APPENDIX.....	69
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	72

LIST OF TABLES

1. Comparison of Sample Population to Total Student Population.....	17
2. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample of Students by Gender and Age Category.....	21
3. Housing Characteristics of the Sample of Students by Gender and Age Category.....	26
4. Distance from Campus, Number of Roommates and Housing Expenditure of the Sample of Students by Gender and Age Category.....	28
5. Frequency Distributions for Student's Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Housing Situation and Total Housing Satisfaction.....	30
6. Satisfaction with Space by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.....	31
7. Satisfaction with Space by Student's Location On or Off-Campus, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy, Distance from Campus, Housing Expenditure, Number of Roommates and Level of Crowding.....	32
8. Satisfaction with Quality by Student's Gender, Age Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.....	36
9. Satisfaction with Quality by Student's On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy, Distance from Campus and Housing Expenditure.....	37
10. Satisfaction with Location by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.....	39
11. Satisfaction with Location by Student's On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy, Distance from Campus and Housing Expenditure.....	40
12. Satisfaction With the Amount of Rent by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.....	41
13. Satisfaction with Amount of Rent by Student's On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy, Distance from Campus and Housing Expenditure.....	42
14. Satisfaction with Maintenance by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.....	44
15. Satisfaction with Maintenance by Student's On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy and Housing Expenditure..	45
16. Satisfaction With the Availability of Parking by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.....	47

17.	Satisfaction With the Availability of Parking by Student's On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy, Distance from Campus and Housing Expenditure.....	48
18.	Satisfaction With the Landlord Relationship by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.....	50
19.	Satisfaction With the Landlord Relationship by Student's On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy and Housing Expenditure.....	51
20.	Total Housing Satisfaction by Student's Gender, Age, Academic Classification, Marital Status and Citizenship.....	52
21.	Total Housing Satisfaction by Students On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Tenure, Duration of Occupancy, Number of Roommates and Housing Expenditure.....	54
22.	Regression Coefficients Obtained for Total Housing Satisfaction with Gender, Ages, Rental Status, Duration of Occupancy, Type of Housing, Crowding, Student Academic Classification, Housing Expenditure, Marital Status, Citizenship, and Rent-free Status as Independent Variables.....	56
23.	Regression Coefficients Obtained for Total Housing Satisfaction with Duration of Occupancy, Crowding, and Rent, Each as Independent Variables.....	62

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Students perceptions of their residence influence their perceptions of the university. (Centra, 1968) If their housing satisfies individual needs, students are likely to perceive the university environment in a positive way. If, however, students perceive their housing as unsatisfactory, they are likely to be disaffected with the entire college environment. This may result in moving to a different housing situation, lowered academic performance, or leaving the school entirely.

One means of improving student's perceptions of the university environment, thus, is to concentrate on assuring satisfactory residential environments.

In analyzing the adequacy of student housing, it is important to investigate the levels of satisfaction experienced by students with their housing and factors related to different levels of satisfaction.

This study analyzes the satisfaction levels with various facets of student housing. Specifically, the study investigates;

- 1) the levels of satisfaction with different types of housing: dormitories, apartments, single family houses, mobile homes, married student housing, rooms, fraternities and

sororities, and cooperative settings;

2) the level of satisfaction with: space, location, quality, maintenance, parking, rent, and relationship with landlord;

3) the relationship of age, gender, marital status, duration of occupancy, tenure, level of crowding, academic classification, housing type, location on or off-campus, housing expenditure, and U.S. or foreign citizenship on the level of satisfaction.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Housing Norms

Individuals judge their housing using certain culturally derived criteria known as norms, which may be formally expressed by rules, codes and guidelines. The level of informality or formality is not necessarily indicative of the amount of importance the society attaches to a particular norm. Although there is a tendency for societies to formalize those norms that seem most important to the maintenance of the society, the importance of the norm derives from its influence on daily life and not simply its means of expression. (Morris & Winter, 1977)

Norms are supported by means of positive and negative sanctions, employed by persons in the community or by individuals themselves. For example, there is strong pressure for married students to live in apartments rather than in a single rooms. Thus landlords will not rent single rooms to married couples. Perhaps the most effective norms are those that are so well taught and widely accepted that individuals apply their own sanctions in the form of guilt feelings, loss of self-respect or shame when a norm is violated.

Three sets of norms enter into the analysis of a housing problem: those of society (cultural norms), those of the

community (community norms) and those of the family (family norms), which are defined as highly individualized standards for housing developed by the family itself that may or may not correspond closely with cultural norms for housing. If the family's housing fails to meet their normatively derived needs, a normative housing deficit is said to exist. (Morris, Crull & Winter, 1976)

The dominant housing norms for this society dictate ownership of a single family housing unit by an individual family, complete with bathroom facilities and a complete kitchen, for the exclusive use of the family. Quality and expenditure norms are based on the socioeconomic status of the family and may best be indicated by the family income. (Morris & Winter, 1978)

The university community is integrated socially and culturally into American society, but as a subgroup of that society, it has developed some norms that apply to students but not to the society as a whole. Inasmuch as universities have traditionally been made up of 18-24 year old persons, (Institute of International Education, 1975) the subgroup norms have tended to reflect cultural norms for that age group. Thus students are more likely to live in congregate housing than similar age cohorts. University housing closely reflects cultural norms, however, as most universities go to greater efforts to see that married students have housing which is consistent with norms (apartments) while only providing dormitory

arrangements for unmarried students.

Current University Housing Problems

Student housing at many institutions of higher learning has come under fire from a variety of sources including students, themselves, who are concerned over the quality of housing available to them, the professional housing staff who are concerned with their ability to meet student needs, and from budget officers who are concerned with the return on their investment dollar. (Madson, Kuder, Mand & Thompson, 1974)

But for all the concern voiced, the literature on college student satisfaction was virtually nonexistent until the late 1960's when researchers reacted to disaffection among students with satisfaction measurement devices and studies of possible reasons for student unrest. (Pervin, Chickering-1967; Levine & Weitz, Rand, Ardyce-1968; Waterman & Waterman, Feldman & Newcomb, Betz, Klingensmith & Menne-1969; Salzman-1970; Antes, Brothers & Hatch, Wynd-1971; Schmidt & Sedlacek-1972)

Some of these studies suffer from methodological shortcomings. For instance, the Wynd study, conducted at Eastern Washington State College in 1971 sampled students without regard for randomness and came up with what were referred to as attitude profiles for both dormitory and apartment residents. Among the conclusions were such generalities as:

Apartment dwellers...want to come and go as they please, eat as they please, party when they please and generally be responsible to no one. (Wynd, 1973)

Some studies have proven a valuable contribution to the field. The Betz, Klingensmith & Menne team designed a measurement instrument, entitled the "College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire", which has, since its creation, been replicated and tested for validity and reliability (Starr, Betz, Menne & Klingensmith-1971; Sturtz-1971; Betz, Starr & Menne-1971; Gallo-1977; DiRuzza-1978) to the point that it is considered the best currently available device for measuring college student satisfaction with various aspects of their total collegial environment. (Strong, 1978)

Internationally, the research into college student satisfaction began somewhat earlier than in the United States due perhaps to the degree of organization within the student populace. (Spaulding & Flack, 1976) In Great Britain, in an attempt to define the increasingly critical attitudes toward residence halls voiced by the National Union of Students, the spokesgroup and lobbyists for all areas of student concern, a number of studies were conducted in the early 1960's (Mann & Mills-1961; Grebenik Report, University of Bath Student Survey-1962; Loughborough, Marris-1964; Bittersea-1966; Eward & Wilson-1967; Cameron-1969).

In other countries, studies have featured a considerable number of research reports, mostly sponsored by a national governmental unit or international organization such as Prodosh's "Social Determinants for Political Attitudes of African Students in German Speaking Countries". (Prodosh, 1966) The majority of

findings have reflected nationalist political ideology by equating satisfaction levels with political attitudes, rather than with students own beliefs. These types of studies tend to ignore the needs and attitudes of the student consumer.

Brothers & Hatch concluded in their compilation of the British studies that a complete analysis of the informal aspects of an academic experience must include consideration of the students' perspective. An understanding of the factors related to student satisfaction with their housing should facilitate analysis of the informal aspects of education. The findings of the few studies of college student satisfaction reported in the major research literature provide little basis for conclusions or generalizations. (Betz, Klingensmith & Menne, 1970)

Satisfaction with Housing:
Influence of Characteristics of the Housing Unit

On or Off-campus Location

In the research examined, there is a fairly consistent pattern of off-campus students expressing higher levels of satisfaction than those students living on-campuses. (Albertus, Dustin & Snider, 1978; Betz, Klingensmith & Menne, 1970; Hailenbeck, 1978; Welty, 1974) Albertus, Dustin and Snider found that off-campus students were more satisfied than dormitory residents with the independence and privacy afforded by their residence. On-campus students considered the major advantage

to be location. (Albertus, 1978) Titus' evaluation of the preferences of on and off-campus students indicated that among men, the first priority with regard to their choice of living situation was the convenience of the physical arrangement of the unit. Among women, regardless of whether they lived on or off-campus, location was first on their list of preferences. (Titus, 1972)

Type of Housing

Off-campus single family house dwellers were found to express more satisfaction with their living arrangements, particularly if they owned the house. (Alfert, 1968; Hallenbeck, 1978) Students living in apartments were more satisfied than those living in on-campus types of housing such as dormitories (Hallenbeck, 1978; Selby & Weston, 1978; Betz, Klingensmith & Menne, 1971; Astin, 1973). At the six schools included in his study, Hatch determined that students who lived in apartments were more satisfied than those living in a room. (Brothers & Hatch, 1971) Among those students living in dormitories, cooperatives or fraternities and sororities, the literature indicated that students living in greek houses and cooperatives were more satisfied with their accommodations than students living in residence halls and dormitories. (Betz, Klingensmith & Menne, 1970; DiRuzza, 1978) Wills sought to determine the relationship between such factors as gender, classification and various life-style options such as visitation policies,

drug use and academia in general. The results of the study pointed to the fact that nearly three-fourths of the residence hall students were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their college housing, a finding that directly opposes the findings of Betz et al. (Wills, 1975)

Duration of Occupancy

The research examined reports a direct relationship between length of time of residence and satisfaction. In most cases a highly satisfied person will not even consider moving despite the fact that objectively speaking, he or she might be better off somewhere else. (Speare, 1974) However, Goldsmith reported that students who had lived in residence halls the shortest length of time had more positive perceptions of the residence hall environment than those who had lived in the residence halls for longer periods of time. (Goldsmith, 1975) Since Goldsmith broke duration of occupancy down by months and included only residence hall occupants, his finding was consistent with the Morris and Winter 1976 finding of the direct relationship between recent mobility and housing satisfaction.

Satisfaction is properly viewed, however as the cause, and duration of residence, as the effect. (Morris & Winter, 1978) Duration of occupancy is caused by satisfaction with one's living conditions. An individual living in poor conditions is likely to experience dissatisfaction and move to more satisfactory conditions, while a person in good living conditions is likely to

stay in the same unit for a longer period of time.

Crowding

Although level of crowding has an effect on behavior, how those levels of density affect individuals is complex and dependent on many other factors in addition to crowding. (Freedman, 1975) The research examined reports an inverse relationship between level of crowding and housing satisfaction. (Selby, 1978; Speare, 1974; Hallenbeck and Balswick, 1978; Morris & Winter, 1978) The Architectural Research Laboratory in Ann Arbor, in their evaluations of school environment, discussed level of crowding as "one of the most important factors in the total environment". (Carson, 1965) And since American housing norms prescribe different rooms for different activities and a dormitory room is expected to serve a number of functions including a study space, a living area and as a bedroom, it is expected that dormitory residents will be likely to be less satisfied with their living conditions than students in other types of housing.

Satisfaction with Housing: Influence of Demographic Characteristics

Age

The research examined consistently showed age to be related to satisfaction, with older students having higher levels of satisfaction with their conditions than younger students. (Rossi, 1955; Sturtz, 1972; Speare, 1974; DiRuzza, 1978)

Gender

The research which addresses itself to gender as a factor in housing satisfaction is inconclusive. Several studies found that gender was not a factor in satisfaction with housing. (Titus, 1970; Tautfest & Townsend, 1968; Betz, Klingensmith & Menne, 1970; Wills, 1975; Valentine, 1976) Other studies found differences between males and females to have some effect on housing satisfaction. (Palmer, 1976; DiRuzza, 1978; Antes, 1971; Gallo, 1977; Wills, 1974; Hallenbeck and Balswick, 1978) Hallenbeck and Balswick indicated that the difference was slight, however, and conditional on triple-occupancy.

Classification

The research addressing itself to student classification as a variable of housing satisfaction reports differing results. Betz, Klingensmith & Menne (1970) and Finley (1971) suggest that freshmen are typically more satisfied with their housing situations, while the DiRuzza (1978) and Wills (1975) studies indicate no differences in satisfaction among various student classifications.

Marital Status

Cultural norms are more strict in terms of the housing requirements of married persons. Thus, fewer alternatives would meet normative requirements, and it is more likely that

a deficit will exist for married students. The National Married Student Housing Survey in 1973 did not compare married students to single students but indicated that there were some problem areas including maintenance, cost, space, human relations and availability of housing. (Pope, 1975)

Citizenship

The literature on the subject of citizenship and its influence on housing satisfaction indicates that foreign students display lower levels of satisfaction with their housing conditions than U.S. students. (DuBois, 1956; Coan, 1966; Educational Facilities Lab, 1977) Some studies, however, have indicated that foreign students are fairly satisfied with their housing. (Kasraian, 1978; Draper, 1938) Neither of these studies, however, compared foreign students with native students.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Research Questions

Based on the literature reviewed in Chapter Two, several research questions were formulated for the purpose of this study.

- 1) How satisfied are students with different types of living arrangements?

- 2) How satisfied are students with their living arrangements in terms of the following aspects of their housing:

- space
- quality
- location
- housing expenditure
- maintenance
- availability of parking
- relationship with the landlord

- 3) What are the influences on housing satisfaction of:

- gender
- age
- marital status
- duration of occupancy
- tenure
- level of crowding
- student academic classification
- type of housing
- on or off-campus location
- housing expenditure
- citizenship

Instrument

The instrument used to gather the data for this study was developed by the author in January of 1979. The questionnaire consisted of forty-five closed-ended questions, which fell into four basic areas:

- 1) current housing situation
- 2) level of crowding
- 3) housing satisfaction
- 4) demographic information

The questionnaire was self-administered with students marking answers coded directly on to optical mark readable (OMR) cards.

To represent the current housing situation, information was acquired concerning the amount of rent paid, the amount of utilities paid by the respondent, the type of housing, the duration of occupancy, tenure status and the distance of the dwelling from the campus.

To ascertain the level of crowding, information was obtained on the number of bedrooms in the housing unit and the number of roommates the respondent lived with.

Housing satisfaction was measured by means of a five point Likert-type scale, with one indicating total dissatisfaction and five denoting total satisfaction. Satisfaction was assessed in terms of the space, quality, location of the

dwelling, housing expenditure, maintenance, parking availability and relationship with the landlord.

The final area of questioning was designed to elicit demographic information about the respondent. Information was acquired concerning the age, gender, student classification, marital status, and citizenship of the respondent, as well as financial dependency of each individual.

Administration of the Questionnaire

During the fall semester, 1978, the director of Admissions and Records at Kansas State University agreed to include the study as part of the spring registration process. At the registration, there were eight separate points of distribution and two points of collection.

Twenty-eight persons acted as disseminators and collectors for the study. They were briefed as to the purpose of the study and instructed to provide assistance in completing the forms if necessary, but not to give suggestions in answering specific questions.

The Sample

The sample consisted of the population of students enrolling at Kansas State University in Manhattan during the regular registration for Spring Semester, in January of 1979.

Response Rate

Approximately 11,000 questionnaires and optical mark readable (OMR) response cards were distributed, of which

9,379 were returned and 9,271 were usable for the study. All classifications were represented in generally proportional numbers to the actual population (Table 1) The response rate was 61.1 percent of the official spring 1979 KSU enrollment.

Measurement of Variables

Demographic Variables

Demographic characteristics were described in terms of gender (male or female); current marital status (currently married or single); academic classification (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, and other which included graduate students as well as various miscellaneous student classifications); citizenship (citizen outside of U.S. or citizen of the U.S.); and age (under twenty, twenty through twenty-two, twenty-three through twenty-five, twenty-six through thirty-five and thirty-six or over).

Housing Variables

Housing variables include location (on or off-campus); tenure (whether the respondent rented, owned or lived rent free); structure type (apartment, mobile home, single family house, room, dormitory, Jardine Terrace which is the married student housing, fraternity or sorority, and cooperative housing); duration of occupancy (less than one month, one to six months, seven to twelve months, thirteen to eighteen months, and more than eighteen months); distance from campus (less than

Table 1. Comparison of Sample Population to Total Student Population.

	Sample Population	Total Population
Percent Distribution		
Age		
Under 20	31.5	
20-22	44.5	
23-25	12.5	Not Available
26-35	9.8	
Over 35	1.8	
	<u>100.0</u> (n=8625)	
Gender		
Male	55.9	57.4
Female	44.1	42.6
	<u>100.0</u> (n=8500)	<u>100.0</u> (n=15173)*
Marital Status		
Single	82.2	81.3
Married	17.8	18.7
	<u>100.0</u> (n=8610)	<u>100.0</u> (n=15173)
Classification		
Freshman	23.1	21.6
Sophomore	20.4	16.0
Junior	21.5	17.0
Senior	22.8	21.6
Other	12.2	24.2
	<u>100.0</u> (n=8649)	<u>100.0</u> (n=17252)*
Citizenship		
U.S. Citizen	89.2	96.1
Citizen of Foreign Country	10.8	3.9
	<u>100.0</u> (n=8547)	<u>100.0</u> (n=17252)
On or Off-Campus Location		
On-campus	42.9	39.6
Off-campus	57.1	60.4
	<u>100.0</u> (n=9203)	<u>100.0</u> (n=17252)

*The discrepancy between the official enrollment figures of the Office of Admissions and Records at KSU is due to the inclusion of 2079 students who are enrolled in the university through its Continuing Education Program, who did not enroll through the regular registration process where the questionnaire was distributed.

one-fifth mile or less than two blocks, one-fifth to one-half mile or two to five blocks, one-half to one mile or five to ten blocks, one to two miles or ten to twenty blocks, and more than two miles or more than twenty blocks). Rent was measured as the actual dollar amount of monthly rent paid by the individual. According to the university Housing Office, 50 percent of the dormitory fee is for meals, so for dormitory residents, the meal costs were deducted so that only housing cost was included.

Crowding

Crowding was measured by roommates (one or less, two, three, four, or five or more) and number of bedrooms (one or less, two, three, four, and five or more). Persons-per-sleeping room was calculated by dividing the number of roommates plus one by the number of bedrooms.

Measures of Satisfaction

Satisfaction with space, quality, location, amount of rent, availability of parking, maintenance of the property and one's relationship with the landlord or landlady, were determined by the use of a five-point Likert-type scale with one representing total dissatisfaction and five indicating total satisfaction. Total satisfaction was calculated by adding the ratings of satisfaction with space, quality, location, and amount of rent paid, with a possible total satisfaction score of from four to twenty. (Appendix 1)

Analysis of the Data

The Kansas State University Grader/Roster Computer program was used to list every response for each of the 9,379 OMR (optical mark reader) cards. Obvious mistakes in the data were located and corrected where possible. Those OMR cards which had an unusually high number of inappropriate responses were eliminated from use in the study.

The SPSS program (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was used for the analysis of the data. In the preliminary analyses, frequency distributions were computed for all of the variables in order to determine the overall characteristics of the sample. Crosstabulations using chi square analysis was used to determine the level of significance of relationships and, where appropriate, Kendall's Tau b or Tau c were used to measure the strength and direction of associations.

Multiple regression analysis was incorporated to determine the partial influences of variables on total satisfaction. The F statistics for individual regression coefficients and each model were examined to determine significant influences.

CHAPTER FOUR

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the characteristics of the sample of students included in the study. Since the purpose is descriptive in nature, crosstabulations with frequency distributions are the primary method used in the presentation of the data.

Demographic Characteristics

Age

Almost half of the students are between the ages of twenty and twenty-two and nearly a third of the student body is under twenty. Foreign students are somewhat older than U.S. students and the older the student, the more likely they are to be upperclass or graduate students. (Table 2)

Gender

Over half of the students are males. Women are more likely to be freshmen and sophomores and men, juniors and seniors.

Marital Status

Most students are single. Students over twenty-six are more likely to be married than single. Males are more likely

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample of Students
by Gender and Age Category.

	Gender		P E R C E N T		D I S T R I B U T I O N		Total Population
	Male	Female	Under 20	20-22	Age Category 23-25	26-35	Over 35
Marital Status							
Single	80.9	85.6	96.0	88.7	70.9	37.9	23.2
Married	19.1	14.4	4.0	11.3	29.1	62.1	76.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(n=4600)	(n=3691)	(n=2605)	(n=3680)	(n=1024)	(n=786)	(n=125)
							(n=8220)
Classification							
Freshman	19.8	25.8	59.5	4.6	7.9	4.9	11.4
Sophomore	18.4	22.6	36.6	14.3	10.9	8.6	10.7
Junior	22.1	21.5	2.9	39.6	13.2	13.5	18.6
Senior	25.7	20.0	.7	36.6	33.8	22.6	12.9
Other	14.1	10.1	.3	4.9	34.2	50.4	46.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(n=4672)	(n=3691)	(n=2630)	(n=3719)	(n=1057)	(n=817)	(n=140)
							(n=8363)
Citizenship							
United States	89.4	90.5	92.5	93.4	85.3	73.8	76.6
Foreign Country	10.6	9.5	7.5	6.6	14.7	26.2	23.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(n=4687)	(n=3651)	(n=2597)	(n=3694)	(n=1038)	(n=818)	(n=141)
							(n=8288)
Racial Dependency							
Parents Only	22.6	37.7	44.6	28.9	13.9	5.6	5.8
Spouse Only	4.5	6.1	1.6	3.9	9.5	13.9	22.6
Independent	34.1	22.4	15.5	27.5	45.5	52.3	58.4
Self and Parents	33.0	29.8	37.9	36.2	21.5	7.5	4.4
Self and Spouse	5.7	4.1	.4	3.5	9.6	20.7	8.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(n=4542)	(n=3593)	(n=2547)	(n=3643)	(n=1024)	(n=784)	(n=137)
							(n=8135)

to be married than females.

Classification

More students were seniors than any other classification. The freshman class was second in size followed by juniors, sophomores and then others which included the graduate classification.

Citizenship

About one in every ten students is not from the U.S. Most students who were from a foreign country tended to be between the ages of twenty-six and thirty-five, although almost as many were over thirty-five.

Financial Dependency

The most common financial situation was a combination of the students own earnings with contributions by their parents. The older the student was, the less likely he or she was to be financially dependent on parents. Married students were dependent upon either themselves and their spouses, or only on their spouse for financial support. Women were more likely to rely only on their parents.

Housing Characteristics

More students live in dormitories than in any other type of housing, followed by apartments, single family houses, and fraternities and sororities. As many students live in the university-owned married student housing complex as live

in mobile homes, followed by cooperative settings and the fewest in rooms. More respondents live off-campus than on, with younger students and females being most likely to live on-campus. Almost three-fourths of the students under twenty live on-campus but under half in the twenty to twenty-two bracket live on-campus.

Type of Housing

Apartment

Almost one quarter of the respondents live in an apartment. About the same percentage of men and women live in apartments, and apartments are most frequent for the twenty-three to twenty-five group.

Mobile Homes

About five percent of the respondents live in a mobile home. Slightly fewer women live in mobile homes than men.

Single Family House

About one out of every eight students lives in a single family house. Only slightly more men reside in a house than women. Of those living in houses, nearly half are over thirty-five.

Rooms

Rooms are the least prevalent housing form, as was mentioned above. Males are more likely to live in rooms than females and students thirty-five and over are more likely to live

in rooms than any other age group.

Dormitories

One in every three students live in a dormitory setting, and many more women than men reside in residence halls. The most likely age group to be living in dormitories are those students under twenty.

Married Student Housing

About five percent live in Jardine Terrace, the married student housing complex owned and operated by the university. Males were more likely than females to live in Jardine Terrace. And it is occupied by more students from the twenty-six to thirty-five age group than from any other.

Fraternities and Sororities

Greek housing is occupied by about twelve percent of the respondents. More men than women reside in greek housing.

Cooperatives

One in twenty-five students reside in a cooperative setting. Older students are more likely to live in cooperatives and slightly more women reside in coops than men.

Tenure

Most students rent their dwelling. Men and women are equally likely to own, rent or live rent-free. Older students are most likely to own, and younger students the most likely age group to live rent-free.

Duration of Occupancy

Almost half of the students had occupied their current dwelling for one to six months, and nearly a quarter had lived in their housing for longer than eighteen months. Males and females were just about as likely to have been living in their current housing for any given amount of time, and older students were more likely to have lived in their current housing for longer lengths of time. (Table 3)

Distance from Campus

Two out of three students lived within five blocks of the campus and nearly half lived less than two blocks away. Women were more likely than men to reside within two blocks. Younger students were likely to live close to campus and older students farther away. (Table 4)

Number of Roommates

Most students shared their dwelling with only one other person and about a quarter of the population had two roommates. Gender appeared to have little to do with the number of roommates a student had although males were slightly more likely to live with five or more other people than females.

Housing Expenditure

Almost half of the students paid less than \$86 per month in rent, while about twenty percent paid more than \$250. Younger students were more likely to be paying lower amounts of rent, and older students, the higher amounts.

Table 3. Housing Characteristics of the Sample of Students by Gender and Age Category.

	Gender		Age Category				Total	
	Male	Female	Under 20	20-22	23-25	26-35	Over 35	Population
On or Off-Campus Location								
On-campus	40.0	47.7	69.5	36.4	22.4	22.7	21.2	43.4
Off-campus	60.0	52.3	30.5	63.6	77.6	77.3	78.8	56.6
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(n=4692)	(n=3698)	(n=2633)	(n=3727)	(n=1055)	(n=829)	(n=146)	(n=8390)
Type of Housing								
Apartment	24.7	24.3	8.5	31.7	37.8	27.7	17.3	24.5
Mobile Home	5.9	4.5	2.0	4.9	11.2	10.6	3.6	5.3
Single Family House	13.5	11.7	6.5	10.5	18.8	29.1	45.3	12.7
Room	1.6	.8	1.0	.8	1.7	3.0	3.6	1.2
Dormitory	29.7	41.6	63.2	28.5	13.6	4.8	8.6	34.9
Jardine Terrace	6.4	3.8	1.6	4.2	8.3	17.3	12.2	5.3
Greek Housing	14.2	8.7	13.9	14.9	4.0	1.4	5.8	11.8
Cooperatives	4.0	4.6	3.3	4.5	4.6	6.1	3.6	4.3
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(n=4583)	(n=3628)	(n=2594)	(n=3667)	(n=1013)	(n=798)	(n=139)	(n=8211)
Tenure								
Rent	85.9	86.3	88.9	89.9	82.4	70.3	57.0	86.1
Own	9.8	8.3	4.0	6.5	13.6	26.9	36.6	9.2
Rent-free	4.3	5.4	7.1	3.6	4.0	2.8	6.4	4.7
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
	(n=4594)	(n=3599)	(n=2551)	(n=3642)	(n=1040)	(n=818)	(n=142)	(n=8193)

Table 3., (cont'd) Housing Characteristics of the Sample of Students

Duration of Occupancy	Gender		P E R C E N T	Under 20	20-22	Age Category		Over 35	Total Population
	Male	Female				23-25	26-35		
Less than one month	7.4	7.5	6.5	7.2	10.9	8.0	4.2	7.5	
1 through 6 months	45.9	49.9	67.7	42.6	36.2	26.5	18.8	47.7	
7 through 12 months	11.7	11.8	7.5	12.9	15.1	16.1	10.4	11.7	
13 through 18 months	12.7	12.3	10.2	12.7	14.3	16.5	3.9	12.5	
More than 18 months	22.3	18.4	8.1	24.6	23.5	32.9	52.8	20.6	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	(n=4672)	(n=3682)	(n=2620)	(n=3709)	(n=1055)	(n=826)	(n=144)	(n=8354)	

Table 4. Distance from Campus, Number of Roommates and Housing Expenditure of the Sample of Students by Gender and Age Category.

	Gender		Age Category						Population
	Male	Female	Under 20	20-22	23-25	26-35	Over 35		
Distance from Campus									
Less than 2 blocks	37.2	49.1	60.8	42.3	23.3	15.6	14.6	42.5	
2 to 5 blocks	27.1	21.9	23.2	27.9	25.0	16.9	18.1	24.8	
5 to 10 blocks	13.9	9.9	7.1	12.1	17.1	20.7	16.7	12.1	
10 to 20 blocks	11.6	8.8	3.8	9.3	18.0	23.2	24.3	10.4	
More than 20 blocks	<u>10.2</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>8.4</u>	<u>16.6</u>	<u>23.6</u>	<u>26.3</u>	<u>10.2</u>	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	(n=4580)	(n=3583)	(n=2528)	(n=3631)	(n=1042)	(n=818)	(n=144)	(n=8163)	
Number of Roommates									
One or less	53.5	57.8	61.8	52.0	58.3	51.1	25.1	55.4	
Two	24.8	21.2	21.0	24.9	24.3	22.1	20.3	23.2	
Three	12.9	12.9	10.0	14.4	10.7	17.1	25.8	12.9	
Four	4.1	4.5	3.2	4.4	3.7	6.6	14.8	4.3	
Five or More	<u>4.7</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>14.0</u>	<u>4.2</u>	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	(n=4336)	(n=3456)	(n=2560)	(n=3479)	(n=919)	(n=706)	(n=128)	(n=7792)	
Housing Expenditure									
Less than \$86	49.0	41.5	55.2	43.8	34.6	19.8	32.7	44.8	
\$86 - \$120	13.1	15.1	5.7	16.3	24.5	27.1	14.5	14.3	
\$121 - \$164	10.0	9.5	5.9	10.3	14.2	17.6	10.9	9.8	
\$165-\$250	8.8	18.3	8.3	16.1	15.8	24.6	14.5	14.0	
More than \$250	<u>19.1</u>	<u>15.6</u>	<u>24.9</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>11.0</u>	<u>11.0</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>17.1</u>	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	(n=2799)	(n=3379)	(n=2159)	(n=2797)	(n=683)	(n=484)	(n=55)	(n=6178)	

CHAPTER FIVE

HOUSING SATISFACTION

The research reviewed indicates that students who live off-campus and students who are older have higher levels of satisfaction with their housing. Some researchers have found that satisfaction may be influenced by marital status, classification, the length of time in a specific dwelling and the level of crowding. As well some researchers have found that various other aspects of the housing situation of students has some relationship to housing satisfaction, such as space, quality and others.

Space

More students reported satisfaction with the amount of space in their housing than reported dissatisfaction, as about 44 percent reported that they were moderately or totally satisfied, and about 27 percent reported they were moderately or totally dissatisfied. (Table 5)

Males expressed higher levels of satisfaction with space than females. Older students were more satisfied, student classification increased and so did the level of satisfaction with space. Married students displayed higher levels of satisfaction with space, and foreign students exhibited lower levels of satisfaction with space than American students. (Table 6)

Table. 5 Frequency Distributions for Student's Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Housing Situation and Total Housing Satisfaction.

Level of Satisfaction	Space	Quality	Location	Housing Cost	Maintenance	Parking	Relationship with Landlord	Total Housing Satisfaction
	P E R C E N T D I S T R I B U T I O N							
Totally Satisfied	22.9	21.0	36.3	20.2	20.8	23.7	27.7	22.5
Moderately Satisfied	21.0	24.1	25.4	19.2	25.0	16.5	23.5	36.9
Neutral	29.2	31.3	21.0	28.8	29.2	19.0	28.8	—
Moderately Dissatisfied	16.6	16.7	10.4	20.0	15.7	17.3	11.6	30.2
Totally Dissatisfied	$\frac{10.3}{100.0}$ (n=8494)	$\frac{7.0}{100.0}$ (n=8489)	$\frac{6.9}{100.0}$ (n=8491)	$\frac{11.8}{100.0}$ (n=8426)	$\frac{9.4}{100.0}$ (n=8444)	$\frac{23.4}{100.0}$ (n=8386)	$\frac{8.4}{100.0}$ (n=8242)	$\frac{10.3}{100.0}$ (n=8269)
Mean	3.30	3.36	3.74	3.16	3.32	3.00	3.51	2.72
Median	3.29	3.34	3.96	3.13	3.36	2.99	3.55	2.76
SD	1.27	1.18	1.24	1.28	1.23	1.49	1.24	.93

Table 6. Satisfaction with Space by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Gender			
Female	3.27	14.86**	c=.023*
Male	3.33		
Age			
Under 20	3.01	324.87**	b=.143**
20-22	3.37		
23-25	3.48		
26-35	3.58		
Over 35	3.91		
Marital Status			
Single	3.28	35.03**	c=.043**
Married	3.44		
Classification			
Freshman	2.98	335.31**	b=.149**
Sophomore	3.15		
Junior	3.36		
Senior	3.35		
Graduate and Other	3.63		
Citizenship			
U.S. Citizen	3.33	24.24**	c=.033**
Foreign Citizen	3.09		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹ Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Table 7. Satisfaction with Space by Student's Location On or Off-Campus, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy, Distance from Campus, Housing Expenditure, Number of Roommates and Level of Crowding

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Location			
On-campus	2.79	1114.81**	c=.399**
Off-campus	3.69		
Type of Housing			
Apartment	3.66	1555.85**	c=-.142**
Mobile Home	3.59		
Single Family House	4.02		
Room	3.21		
Dormitory	2.68		
Jardine Terrace	2.88		
Greek Housing	2.22		
Cooperative	3.52		
Duration of Occupancy			
Less than one month	3.38	157.95**	b=.056**
1 - 6 months	3.19		
7 - 12 months	3.40		
13 - 18 months	3.20		
More than 18 months	3.52		
Distance from Campus			
Less than 2 blocks	2.99	625.57**	b=.209**
2 to 5 blocks	3.37		
5 to 10 blocks	3.50		
10 to 20 blocks	3.70		
More than 20 blocks	3.91		
Housing Expenditure			
\$0 - \$85.00	3.00	526.94**	b=.044**
\$86.00 - \$120.00	3.50		
\$121.00 - 164.00	3.68		
\$165.00 - \$250.00	3.64		
More than \$250.00	2.15		

Table 7., (cont'd) Satisfaction with Space¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Roommates			
One or less	2.93	222.07**	b=.112**
Two	3.26		
Three	3.55		
Four	3.73		
Five or more	3.64		
Crowding			
Less than one	3.24	1093.31**	c=-.181**
One	3.63		
Two	3.33		
Three	2.95		
Four	3.08		
Five	3.24		
Six	3.11		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Students living off-campus expressed more satisfaction with space, as did students who had lived in the same housing for longer periods of time. Students whose housing was farther away from campus also displayed higher levels of satisfaction with space as did students with more roommates. However, when comparing the level of crowding to satisfaction with space, students who experienced lower levels of crowding expressed more satisfaction with the amount of space they had. Students who paid more in rent also expressed more satisfaction with the amount of space in their dwelling. Students who lived in apartments, single family houses, and in mobile homes displayed the highest levels of satisfaction with space while those living in dormitories, married student housing, and in fraternities and sororities exhibited relatively low levels of satisfaction

Quality

More students were satisfied with the quality of their housing than were dissatisfied. About forty-five percent of the students were totally or moderately satisfied with the quality of their housing while about 24 percent were either moderately or totally dissatisfied with their housing quality. (Table 5)

As students rose from freshmen to juniors and so on through the graduate classification, their levels of satisfaction with quality increased. Older students were more satisfied with

the quality of their housing, as were married students. Students from outside of the U.S. were less satisfied than native students. There was no difference between males and females in regard to satisfaction with quality. (Table 8)

Students living off-campus, residents of fraternity and sorority houses, cooperatives and apartments, students whose housing was a greater distance from the campus and those who paid higher levels of rent were more satisfied with the quality of their housing. Less satisfied were on-campus students, students living in dormitories, single family houses and in mobile homes, those who lived closer to the campus, those whose duration of occupancy was relatively short and those who paid the highest level of rent for their housing. (Table 9)

Location

Over half of the respondents reported moderate or total satisfaction with the location of their dwelling while about 17 percent are moderately or totally dissatisfied. (Table 5)

Age, academic classification and citizenship were found to be significantly related to satisfaction with location. Older students, upperclassmen and graduate students and those students from this country experienced higher levels of satisfaction with the location of their dwelling while foreign students, lowerclassmen and younger students were associated with lower levels of location satisfaction. Females were found to be more satisfied with this aspect of their housing than males and married students displayed higher levels of

Table 9. Satisfaction with Quality by Student's
On or Off-Campus Location, Type of
Housing, Duration of Occupancy, Distance
from Campus and Housing Expenditure¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Location			
On-campus	3.08	531.44**	c=.240**
Off-campus	3.57		
Type of Housing			
Apartment	3.40	1031.16**	c=-.023**
Mobile Home	2.72		
Single Family House	3.01		
Room	3.34		
Dormitory	2.99		
Jardine Terrace	3.06		
Greek Housing	3.76		
Cooperative	3.61		
Duration of Occupancy			
Less than one month	3.30	224.54**	b=.088**
1 - 6 months	3.24		
7 - 12 months	3.39		
13 - 18 months	3.36		
More than 18 months	3.60		
Distance from Campus			
Less than 2 blocks	3.19	419.70**	b=.139**
2 to 5 blocks	3.34		
5 to 10 blocks	3.42		
10 to 20 blocks	3.56		
More than 20 blocks	3.88		
Housing Expenditure			
\$0 - \$85.00	3.16	455.54**	b=.038**
\$86.00 - \$120.00	3.39		
\$121.00 - \$164.00	3.65		
\$165.00 - \$250.00	3.65		
More than \$250.00	2.97		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Table 8. Satisfaction with Quality by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Gender			
Female	3.40	7.59	b=.077**
Male	3.34		
Age			
Under 20	3.23	169.99**	b=.077**
20-22	3.37		
23-25	3.46		
26-35	3.56		
Over 35	3.92		
Marital Status			
Single	3.34	49.98**	c=.039**
Married	3.47		
Classification			
Freshman	2.64	125.95**	b=.086**
Sophomore	2.66		
Junior	2.71		
Senior	2.88		
Graduate and Other	3.04		
Citizenship			
U.S. Citizen	3.39	68.05**	c=.051**
Foreign Citizen	2.92		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

satisfaction with the location of their dwelling than did single students. (Table 10)

Students living off-campus, living in a single family house, room or greek accomodation, students who had maintained the same dwelling for longer periods of time, those who lived either within five blocks from the campus or more than twenty, and students who paid relatively lower amounts of rent were more likely to be satisfied with their location. (Table 11)

Housing Expenditure

About 40 percent of the respondents reported moderate or total satisfaction with the cost of their housing while about 32 percent were moderately or totally dissatisfied. (Table 5)

As age and student academic classification rose, satisfaction with the cost of housing also increased. Married students displayed higher levels of satisfaction with the amount of rent they paid than did single students and foreign students were found to be less satisfied with their housing expenditure than were students from this country. (Table 12)

Students who lived off-campus, greater distances from the campus, paid lower amounts in rent and had lived in the same dwelling for longer periods of time expressed more satisfaction with the cost of their housing. Students who lived in mobile homes, single family houses and in rooms and married student housing displayed higher levels of satisfaction with their housing expenditure than did students who lived in dorms, apartments or fraternity and sorority houses. (Table 13)

Table 10. Satisfaction with Location by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Gender			
Female	3.86	44.86**	c=-.078**
Male	3.68		
Age			
Under 20	3.68	69.03**	b=.027**
20-22	3.77		
23-25	3.69		
26-35	3.80		
Over 35	4.08		
Marital Status			
Single	3.78	21.94**	c=-.034**
Married	3.63		
Classification			
Freshman	3.60	80.63**	b=.064**
Sophomore	3.67		
Junior	3.81		
Senior	3.82		
Graduate and Other	3.87		
Citizenship			
U.S. Citizen	3.78	40.10**	c=.046**
Foreign Citizen	3.49		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Table 11. Satisfaction with Location by Student's
On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing,
Duration of Occupancy, Distance from Campus
and Housing Expenditure.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Location			
On-campus	3.70	66.77**	c=.038**
Off-campus	3.77		
Type of Housing			
Apartment	3.78	213.86**	c=-.016*
Mobile Home	3.62		
Single Family House	3.93		
Room	3.82		
Dormitory	3.71		
Jardine Terrace	3.50		
Greek Housing	3.82		
Cooperative	3.70		
Duration of Occupancy			
Less than one month	3.45	158.45**	b=.094**
1 - 6 months	3.74		
7 - 12 months	3.77		
13 - 18 months	3.81		
More than 18 months	3.93		
Distance from Campus			
Less than two blocks	4.00	536.51**	b=.176**
2 to 5 blocks	3.74		
5 to 10 blocks	3.35		
10 to 20 blocks	3.23		
More than 20 blocks	3.58		
Housing Expenditure			
\$0 - \$85.00	3.79	54.16**	b=-.037**
\$86.00 - \$120.00	3.75		
\$121.00 - \$164.00	3.88		
\$165.00 - \$250.00	3.71		
More than \$250.00	3.58		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Table 12. Satisfaction With the Amount of Rent by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Gender			
Female	3.13	6.10	c=, -.25*
Male	3.19		
Age			
Under 20	2.59	358.37**	b=, .153**
20-22	3.16		
23-25	3.42		
26-35	3.61		
Over 35	3.80		
Marital Status			
Single	3.07	280.52**	c=, .137**
Married	3.61		
Classification			
Freshman	2.50	258.27**	b=, .129**
Sophomore	2.60		
Junior	2.73		
Senior	2.95		
Graduate and Other	3.14		
Citizenship			
U.S. Citizen	3.18	15.34**	c=, .024**
Foreign Citizen	3.03		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Table 13. Satisfaction with Amount of Rent by Student's On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy, Distance from Campus and Housing Expenditure.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Location			
On-campus	2.76	664.69**	c=.310**
Off-campus	3.47		
Type of Housing			
Apartment	3.31	1290.57**	c=-.051**
Mobile Home	3.54		
Single Family House	3.75		
Room	3.75		
Dormitory	2.55		
Jardine Terrace	3.69		
Greek Housing	3.39		
Cooperative	3.53		
Duration of Occupancy			
Less than one month	3.14	331.46**	b=.100**
1 - 6 months	3.01		
7 - 12 months	3.20		
13 - 18 months	3.19		
More than 18 months	3.49		
Distance from Campus			
Less than two blocks	2.88	589.88**	b=.185**
2 to 5 blocks	3.21		
5 to 10 blocks	3.55		
10 to 20 blocks	3.46		
More than 20 blocks	3.76		
Housing Expenditure			
\$0 - \$85.00	2.94	359.24**	b=-.015
\$86.00 - \$120.00	3.46		
\$121.00 - \$164.00	3.44		
\$165.00 - \$250.00	3.21		
More than \$250.00	2.58		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Maintenance

More students reported satisfaction with the amount of maintenance of the property than reported dissatisfaction, as about 45 percent reported that they were moderately or totally satisfied, and about 25 percent reported that they were moderately or totally dissatisfied. (Table 5)

Females expressed higher levels of satisfaction with the amount of maintenance of their property than males. Older students were more satisfied, and as the level of satisfaction with maintenance went up, academic classification increased. Married students displayed higher levels of satisfaction with property maintenance, and foreign students exhibited lower levels of satisfaction with maintenance than American students. (Table 14)

Students living off-campus expressed more satisfaction with maintenance, as did students who had lived in the same housing for longer periods of time. Students who lived in single family houses, fraternity and sorority houses, and in cooperative settings displayed the highest levels of satisfaction with maintenance while those living in dormitories, apartments and married student housing exhibited relatively low levels of satisfaction. (Table 15)

Parking

Slightly more students were satisfied with the availability of parking than were dissatisfied. About 40 percent

Table 14. Satisfaction with Maintenance by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Gender			
Female	3.35	21.59**	c=-.028*
Male	3.30		
Age			
Under 20	3.27	172.55**	b=.053**
20-22	3.28		
23-25	3.31		
26-35	3.60		
Over 35	3.93		
Marital Status			
Single	3.30	89.82**	c=.050**
Married	3.95		
Classification			
Freshman	2.72	77.97**	b=.046**
Sophomore	2.81		
Junior	2.69		
Senior	2.80		
Graduate and Other	2.99		
Citizenship			
U.S. Citizen	3.35	22.09**	c=.025**
Foreign Citizen	3.16		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Table 15. Satisfaction with Maintenance by Student's
On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing,
Duration of Occupancy and Housing Expenditure.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Location			
On-campus	3.17	255.85**	b=.078**
Off-campus	3.44		
Type of Housing			
Apartment	3.24	578.63**	c=.017*
Mobile Home	3.43		
Single Family House	3.70		
Room	3.49		
Dormitory	3.12		
Jardine Terrace	3.28		
Greek Housing	3.60		
Cooperative	3.54		
Duration of Occupancy			
Less than one month	3.26	210.66**	b=.079**
1 - 6 months	2.49		
7 - 12 months	3.29		
13 - 18 months	3.55		
More than 18 months	3.57		
Housing Expenditure			
\$0 - \$85.00	3.21	203.88**	b=.016
\$86.00 - \$120.00	3.31		
\$121.00 - \$164.00	3.53		
\$165.00 - \$250.00	3.42		
More than \$250.00	3.08		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

of the students were totally or moderately satisfied with the availability of parking while about 40 percent were either moderately or totally dissatisfied with the parking available to them. (Table 5)

Males, married students, older students and upperclass and graduate students displayed higher levels of satisfaction with parking. Lower levels of satisfaction were expressed by single students, lowerclassmen and younger students. There was no difference between U.S. and foreign students with regard to satisfaction with parking. (Table 16)

Students living off-campus, those who had resided in the same dwelling for relatively longer periods of time and those who lived a greater distance from the campus were more satisfied with parking. Students who lived in mobile homes, single family houses, rooms and in fraternity and sorority houses displayed the highest relative levels of satisfaction with the availability of parking, while students living in dormitories, married student housing and in cooperatives exhibited low satisfaction levels. (Table 17)

Landlord Relationship

Over half of the respondents reported moderate or total satisfaction with the relationship they had with their landlords while about 20 percent were moderately or totally dissatisfied. (Table 5)

Males expressed higher levels of satisfaction than females and as age and academic classification increased, so did the

Table 16. Satisfaction With the Availability of Parking
by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status,
Academic Classification and Citizenship.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Gender			
Female	2.88	92.71**	c=.094**
Male	3.11		
Age			
Under 20	2.42	979.41**	b=.254**
20-22	3.09		
23-25	3.42		
26-35	3.75		
Over 35	3.99		
Marital Status			
Single	2.07	294.17**	c=.161**
Married	3.60		
Classification			
Freshman	2.22	693.20**	b=.212**
Sophomore	2.68		
Junior	2.91		
Senior	3.10		
Graduate and Other	3.17		
Citizenship			
U.S. Citizen	2.99	4.35	c=-.015*
Foreign Citizen	3.04		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Table 17. Satisfaction With the Availability of Parking by Student's On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy, Distance from Campus and Housing Expenditure.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Location			
On-Campus	2.34	1278.99**	c=.436**
Off-campus	3.51		
Type of Housing			
Apartment	3.32	1927.16**	c=-.110**
Mobile Home	3.70		
Single Family House	3.91		
Room	3.51		
Dormitory	2.09		
Jardine Terrace	3.25		
Greek Housing	3.44		
Cooperative	3.10		
Duration of Occupancy			
Less than one month	2.99	348.90**	b=.136**
1 - 6 months	2.74		
7 - 12 months	3.15		
13 - 18 months	3.13		
More than 18 months	3.46		
Distance from Campus			
Less than two blocks	2.51	1065.21**	b=.286**
2 to 5 blocks	3.05		
5 to 10 blocks	3.45		
10 to 20 blocks	3.65		
More than 20 blocks	3.99		
Housing Expenditure			
\$0 - \$85.00	2.89	779.99**	b=.071**
\$86.00 - \$120.00	3.32		
\$121.00 - \$164.00	3.52		
\$165.00 - \$250.00	3.54		
More than \$250.00	2.22		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

level of satisfaction with the relationship with their landlord. Married students displayed slightly higher levels of satisfaction with this area of their housing and foreign students exhibited lower levels than American students. (Table 18)

Students paying more rent, those living off-campus, those who had lived in the same place for longer periods of time and students living in single family houses, fraternities and sororities, and in cooperatives and mobile homes were found to display higher levels of satisfaction with their relationship with the landlord. (Table 19)

Total Housing Satisfaction

Over half of the respondents reported moderate or total satisfaction with their housing situation in general while about 40 percent were moderately or totally dissatisfied. (Table 5)

Older students, upper class and graduate students and those who were married and not foreign were found to display higher levels of total satisfaction with their housing situations. There was no difference between males and females with regard to total satisfaction. (Table 20)

Students who lived off-campus, who had lived in the same housing unit for longer periods of time, who had more roommates and who lived rent-free were found to exhibit the highest levels of total satisfaction with their housing situation. As might have been expected from the previous findings in this study, a negative correlation was found between total housing satisfaction and type of structure indicating that higher

Table 18. Satisfaction With the Landlord Relationship by Student's Gender, Age, Marital Status, Academic Classification and Citizenship.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Gender			
Female	3.49	19.03**	c=.025*
Male	3.56		
Age			
Under 20	3.40	216.32**	b=.091**
20-22	3.46		
23-25	3.63		
26-35	3.88		
Over 35	4.06		
Marital Status			
Single	3.52	62.56**	c=.014
Married	3.53		
Classification			
Freshman	2.40	181.79**	b=.108**
Sophomore	2.63		
Junior	2.71		
Senior	2.87		
Graduate and Other	2.98		
Citizenship			
U.S. Citizen	3.57	51.72**	c=.045**
Foreign Citizen	3.23		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Table 19. Satisfaction With the Landlord Relationship by Student's On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Duration of Occupancy and Housing Expenditure.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Location			
On-campus	3.10	323.10**	c=.187**
Off-campus	3.70		
Type of Housing			
Apartment	3.53	738.45**	c=-.014
Mobile Home	3.64		
Single Family House	3.95		
Room	3.71		
Dormitory	3.21		
Jardine Terrace	3.46		
Greek Housing	3.77		
Cooperative	3.68		
Duration of Occupancy			
Less than one month	3.11	189.12**	b=.084*
1 to 6 months	3.20		
7 to 12 months	3.23		
13 to 18 months	3.23		
More than 18 months	3.35		
Housing Expenditure			
\$0 - \$85.00	3.38	293.85**	b=.018*
\$86.00 - \$120.00	3.66		
\$121.00 - \$164.00	3.68		
\$165.00 - \$250.00	3.73		
More than \$250.00	3.16		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

¹Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Table 20. Total Housing Satisfaction by Student's Gender, Age, Academic Classification, Marital Status and Citizenship.¹

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Gender			
Female	2.67	4.19	c=.007
Male	2.69		
Age			
Under 20	2.48	306.28**	c=.142**
20-22	2.73		
23-25	2.80		
26-35	2.96		
Over 35	3.14		
Classification			
Freshman	2.43	365.43**	c=.178**
Sophomore	2.56		
Junior	2.74		
Senior	2.83		
Graduate and Other	2.98		
Marital Status			
Single	2.66	88.36**	c=.065**
Married	2.84		
Citizenship			
U.S. Citizen	2.70	49.69**	c=.040**
Foreign Citizen	2.52		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

levels of satisfaction were associated with off-campus types of housing such as single family houses while lower levels of total satisfaction were exhibited by those residing in on-campus housing structures such as dormitories. Students paying higher amounts of rent were found to be less satisfied with their housing. (Table 21)

Regression Models
for Total Housing Satisfaction

In order to determine the partial influences of the independent variables age, gender, rental status, duration of occupancy, type of housing, crowding, academic classification, housing cost, marital status, rent-free status and citizenship on total housing satisfaction, the following model for total satisfaction was developed:

$$\text{Total Satisfaction} = f(\text{Gender, Age, Rental Status, Duration of Occupancy, Type of Housing, Crowding, Academic Classification, Housing Cost, Citizenship, and Rent-free Status})$$

where:

Gender 0 = Female
 1 = Male

Age 20-22
 0 = not 20-22
 1 = 20-22

Age 23-25
 0 = not 23-25
 1 = 23-25

Age 26-35
 0 = not 26-35
 1 = 26-35

Table 21. Total Housing Satisfaction by Student's On or Off-Campus Location, Type of Housing, Tenure, Duration of Occupancy, Number of Roommates and Housing Expenditure.

	Mean	Chi Square	Kendall's Tau
Location			
On-campus	2.42	626.58**	c=.310**
Off-Campus	2.90		
Type of Housing			
Apartment	2.86	1016.43**	c=-.056**
Mobile Home	2.71		
Single Family House	3.03		
Room	2.55		
Dormitory	2.32		
Jardine Terrace	2.70		
Greek Housing	2.98		
Cooperative	2.85		
Tenure			
Rent	2.68	289.41**	c=.065**
Own	2.85		
Free	3.18		
Duration of Occupancy			
Less than one month	2.63	113.65**	c=.070**
1 - 6 months	2.61		
7 - 12 months	2.75		
13 - 18 months	2.71		
More than 18 months	2.84		
Roommates			
One or less	2.62	103.04**	c=.058**
Two	2.64		
Three	2.81		
Four	2.87		
Five or more	2.79		
Housing Expenditure			
\$0 - \$85.00	2.52	445.25**	c=-.005
\$86.00 - \$120.00	2.85		
\$121.00 - \$164.00	2.96		
\$165.00 - \$250.00	2.86		
More than \$250.00	2.30		

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Levels of satisfaction range from 1 to 5 with 1 representing total dissatisfaction and 5 representing total satisfaction

Age 36+

0 = not 36+

1 = 36+

Rental Status

0 = Rent

1 = Not rent

Duration of Occupancy

1 = .5 month

2 = 5 months

3 = 10 months

4 = 17 months

5 = 30 months

Type of Housing

0 = Not in a dormitory

1 = Dormitory

Crowding

Actual level of crowding
(roommates + 1) ÷ number of bedrooms

Student Classification

0 = Freshman

1 = Sophomore

2 = Junior

3 = Senior

4 = Graduate student and others

Housing Expenditure

Dollar amount of rental payment

Marital Status

0 = Not married

1 = Married

Rent-free Status

0 = Not rent-free

1 = Rent-free

Citizenship

0 = Foreign student

1 = U.S. student

Coefficients obtained for the model of total satisfaction appear in Table 22. Of the fifteen independent variables included in the model, males were significantly less likely to be satisfied, those between the ages of twenty and twenty-two were significantly less satisfied while students who were thirty-six or

Table 22. Regression Coefficients Obtained for Total Housing Satisfaction with Gender, Ages, Rental Status, Duration of Occupancy, Type of Housing, Crowding, Student Academic Classification, Housing Expenditure, Marital Status, Citizenship, and Rent-free Status as Independent Variables.

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	F
Gender		
0 = Female		
1 = Male	-.12**	25.99
Age 20		
0 = not 20-22		
1 = 20-22	-.06*	3.40
Age 23-25		
0 = not 23-25		
1 = 23-25	-.08	2.71
Age 26-35		
0 = not 26-35		
1 = 26-35	.02	0.27
Age 36+		
0 = not 36+		
1 = 36+	.22*	5.56
Rental Status		
0 = Rent		
1 = not rent	-.06	2.39
Duration of Occupancy measured in months	.01**	15.11
Type of Housing		
0 = not dorm		
1 = dorm	-.51**	345.88
Crowding (roommates + 1) + bedrooms	-.05**	17.14

Table 22., (cont'd) Regression Coefficients Obtained

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	F
Academic Classification		
0 = Freshman		
1 = Sophomore		
2 = Junior		
3 = Senior		
4 = Graduate and Others	.06**	21.00
Housing Expenditure		
Actual dollar amount	-.01*	0.55
Marital Status		
0 = not married		
1 = married	-.06*	3.45
Citizenship		
0 = not U.S.		
1 = U.S.	0.28**	56.41
Rent-free Status		
0 = not free		
1 = free	0.30**	23.52
Constant	2.66	

$$R^2 = .11$$

$$F = 56.68$$

$$df = 14$$

* Significant at .05 level, one tailed test

** Significant at .01 level, one tailed test

over were significantly more satisfied with their total housing situation. Students living in the same dwelling for longer periods of time were significantly more satisfied as were those who lived in conditions which were less crowded. Living in a dormitory made it significantly less likely that the student would experience high levels of total housing satisfaction. Students in upperclass and graduate academic classification were significantly more likely to be totally satisfied with their housing situation, while paying higher levels of rent was significantly related to lower levels of total housing satisfaction. Married students and foreign students were significantly less likely to be satisfied and those who lived rent-free were significantly more likely to be satisfied than either owners or renters.

Although not significant, students in the twenty-six to thirty-five year old age group had a slight tendency to exhibit higher levels of satisfaction. Had the age groupings been broken down further, the older grouping may have been found to be significant, particularly since the over thirty-five age group experienced significantly higher levels of total satisfaction. Total satisfaction with one's housing increased the longer a student resided at any single dwelling, and as was mentioned above, the effect of living in a dormitory had a negative influence on total satisfaction. Students who lived in dorms were much less satisfied with their total housing situation than students living in other types of housing.

Increased levels of crowding also had a negative influence on total housing satisfaction. Total housing satisfaction was influenced positively by upperclass and graduate classification as well as by U.S. citizenship and living rent-free.

The overall F value of 56.68 indicated that the eleven independent variables which were found to have a significant influence on total housing satisfaction were significant at the .10 level on total satisfaction. The R^2 obtained in the analysis indicated that the independent variables included in the model accounted for 11 percent of the variance in total housing satisfaction.

The Independent Influence of Duration of Occupancy
on Total Housing Satisfaction

Since duration of occupancy, through its inclusion in the regression model, was found to be significant the independent variable, duration of occupancy, appeared to warrant some independent investigation. It was desirable to determine more specifically, the relationship between total housing satisfaction and duration of occupancy. Therefore, in order to determine the relationship of duration of occupancy to total housing satisfaction, the following model for total satisfaction was developed:

$$\text{Total Satisfaction} = f(\text{Duration of Occupancy})$$

where:

Duration of Occupancy
measured in months

The coefficient obtained for the model for total satisfaction appears in Table 23. The single variable included in the model, duration of occupancy, was found to have an influence significant at the .10 level. The regression result indicates that duration of occupancy increases as total housing satisfaction increases.

The overall F value of 152.01 indicates that the independent variable had a significant relationship to total housing satisfaction at the .10 level. The R^2 obtained in the analysis indicates that duration of occupancy accounted for 1.8 percent of the variance in total satisfaction. Had the model read in reverse, where duration of occupancy was a function of total housing satisfaction, the R^2 obtained would be likely to have been larger.

The Independent Influence of Level of Crowding
on Total Housing Satisfaction

In order to determine the independent relationship between level of crowding and total housing satisfaction, without the influence of other extraneous factors weighting the relationship one way or the other a separate regression model for total satisfaction was developed. That model is:

$$\text{Total Satisfaction} = f(\text{Crowding})$$

where:

Crowding

(roommates + 1) ÷ number of
bedrooms

The coefficient obtained for the model of total satisfaction

appear in Table 23. The single variable included in the model, level of crowding, was found to have influence, significant at the 95 percent level. Lower levels of crowding significantly influenced higher levels of total housing satisfaction.

The Influence of Rental Payment
on Total Housing Satisfaction

Since rent was significant only at the .05 level when included as an independent variable in the regression model for total housing satisfaction, in order to see its independent influence without other independent variables, a regression needed to be calculated. So in order to determine the independent partial influence of the independent variable, rent, on total housing satisfaction, the following model for total satisfaction was developed:

$$\text{Total Satisfaction} = f(\text{Rent})$$

where: Rent is measured by actual dollar expenditure

The coefficient obtained for the model of total satisfaction appears in Table 23. The single variable included in the model, rent, was found to have no significant relationship to total housing satisfaction.

Table 23. Regression Coefficients Obtained for Total Housing Satisfaction with Duration of Occupancy, Crowding, and Rent, Each as Independent Variables.

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	F
Duration of Occupancy	0.05*	152.01
Constant	12.89	
$R^2 = .02$	$df = 1$	
$F = 152.01$		
Crowding	-0.47*	122.99
Constant	14.27	
$R^2 = .02$	$df = 1$	
$F = 122.99$		
Rent	-0.00	0.02
Constant	2.72	
$R^2 = 0.00$	$df = 1$	
$F = 0.02$		

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The findings of this study indicate that students living in single family houses, in mobile homes and in cooperative settings experience high levels of satisfaction with their living arrangements. Students living in rooms, apartments and in greek housing experience mixed levels of satisfaction with their housing conditions. Apartment dwellers expressed high levels of satisfaction with the space available in their housing but low levels of satisfaction in terms of the cost of their housing. Although students living in fraternities and sororities indicated that they were very satisfied with the maintenance of the property and its location, they expressed disaffection with the cost of the housing. The findings were clear in determining how satisfied students who live in dormitories and college run married student housing are. Students living in these two arrangements expressed consistently lower levels of satisfaction with nearly every aspect of their housing situation. (with the exception of Jardine Terrace residents who were relatively satisfied with the cost of their housing) As the regression model indicated, living in a dormitory had the largest single negative influence on housing satisfaction.

There was a statistically significant difference in the level of satisfaction of students living on and off-campus. On-campus students were consistently less satisfied with every aspect of their housing situation than off-campus residents. Students living in dormitories and in the married student housing complex run by the university expressed low levels of satisfaction with the quality of their housing, students living in cooperatives and in fraternities and sororities expressed high levels of satisfaction with that same aspect of their living situation. Apartment dwellers were relatively less satisfied than residents of fraternities and sororities with the quality afforded them in their housing conditions.

While males expressed significantly higher levels of satisfaction with space, landlord relationship and maintenance, females expressed higher levels of satisfaction with location. There were no statistically significant differences between men and women in how satisfied they were with quality, housing expenditure or in their levels of total housing satisfaction.

The findings of the study consistently indicated that older students, upperclass and graduate students, married students and students who were not from a foreign country experienced higher levels of satisfaction with all aspects of their housing conditions which were included in the study.

Greater distances from campus were found to be related to higher levels of satisfaction with all of the aspects of

housing against which this particular variable was measured.

Policy Implications

The implications for the future of universities are challenging. The influx of foreign students, an aging student population, and stabilization of enrollment expected in the 1980's requires universities to reevaluate some of their policies and pay more attention to the student as a consumer of educational goods. This encompasses the type of housing and satisfaction with the housing in which students live.

A key to implementing policy which will best meet the needs of student consumers and result in satisfaction, is having a clear understanding of the nature of the needs and problems. An understanding of student satisfaction with different aspects of the housing situation is a necessary component of a complete understanding of the housing situation and indicates where students, themselves feel problems exist. Continued monitoring of the changes in demographic composition and attitudes among students is desirable in order to assess trends and deal effectively with changes.

The findings of this study indicate that the university could make changes in the housing it provides which would increase satisfaction levels. Dormitory students expressed low levels of satisfaction with maintenance and cost, even though in comparison to off-campus housing, it is relatively inexpensive. Students living in mobile homes, single family houses and in cooperatives exhibited the highest levels of satisfaction.

A possibility for change is to model the existing university housing after those types of housing situations which produce higher satisfaction levels. Those students expressing the highest levels of satisfaction with the maintenance of the property live in types of housing where they are involved personally in the upkeep of the premises. Providing a reduced fee for housing in return for students being responsible for specific maintenance duties could enable students to be more personally involved in their housing and result in increased satisfaction.

Another possibility for changing the traditional dorms is to convert smaller dorms to cooperatives. Since students express high levels of satisfaction with cooperatives, converting Edwards Hall and the economically inefficient Strong Complex into cooperative housing would both increase the alternatives available to students and their satisfaction.

The University should also pay more attention to mobile homes as a housing alternative. North Campus Court, the only university owned mobile home park, is to be torn down. It is questionable why the university should do away with a housing situation which is satisfying to students and financially beneficial to the university.

In the area of foreign student housing, this study found that foreign students are very dissatisfied with their housing situations. Their needs are not being met, but effective changes cannot be instituted until their needs are known. In this study, student input is definitely known, so that policies can reflect

the needs as the students see them, not the needs as seen by university personnel, who may be unfamiliar with the housing and cultural norms held by the students. One change in this area could be to remove the University Foreign Student Union from housing activities or place someone at the Union who has some expertise in the area of housing and can assess the needs of foreign students in an objective manner. In addition, the head of the foreign student center should either be disallowed from being a landlord or should have no input as to the types of housing which might fulfill the needs of foreign students.

Conclusion

The implementation of any policy which attempts to treat the symptoms rather than the causes will, in the short term surface as superficial and in the long term, fiscally wasteful and entirely inadequate in dealing with the problems. Perhaps worst of all, a symptomatic approach to student housing problems invites already dissatisfied students to seek an alternative environment which will meet the needs not being fulfilled by the university environment.

As long as housing conditions influence the way in which students view the college experience, positive change in student housing conditions are likely to affect positive change in their attitudes toward school in general. As a result, students may spend less time in pursuing escapes from their conditions and more time in pursuing those high goals they had in mind in pursuing an education in the first place. In the words of the

late poet. Carl Sandburg:

I was foolish about windows.
The house was an old one and the windows
were small.
I asked a carpenter to come and open the
walls and put in bigger windows...
One neighbor said, "If you keep on you'll be
able to see everything there is."

Carl Sandburg from
"Foolish About Windows" in
Good Morning America, 1928.

APPENDIX

KSU HOUSING CENSUS SPRING 1979

INSTRUCTIONS

Complete the census questions using the response card provided and return both the questionnaire and your response card as you pass through the doorway leading to the Men's Gym. DO NOT WRITE ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. If you object to any single question being asked, feel free to leave that question unanswered.

Begin

A. Mark the amount of monthly rent you pay on the side of your response card marked "Front", in the first set of white blocks under the section marked "Student Number", as shown below. (e.g. \$150.00 in monthly rent)

Example:

1. Do you live:
 - 1 - On-Campus
 - 2 - Off-Campus
2. Do you currently:
 - 1 - Rent your dwelling
 - 2 - Own your dwelling
 - 3 - Live rent free
3. Which type of housing do you presently have:
 - 1 - Apartment
 - 2 - Mobile Home
 - 3 - House
 - 4 - Room
 - 5 - None of the above
4. Which type of housing do you presently have:
 - 1 - Dormitory
 - 2 - Jardine Terrace (married student housing)
 - 3 - Fraternity or Sorority
 - 4 - Cooperative Housing
 - 5 - None of the above
5. How long have you lived in your current dwelling:
 - 1 - Less than one month
 - 2 - One through six months
 - 3 - Seven through twelve months
 - 4 - Thirteen through eighteen months
 - 5 - More than eighteen months

6. How far away from campus do you live: (1 block = 1/10 mile)
- 1 - Less than 1/5 mile (Less than 2 blocks)
 - 2 - 1/5 to 1/2 mile (2 to 5 blocks)
 - 3 - 1/2 to 1 mile (5 to 10 blocks)
 - 4 - 1 to 2 miles (10 to 20 blocks)
 - 5 - More than 2 miles (More than 20 blocks)
7. Mark the number of bedrooms you have.
8. How many people do you share your housing unit with? (If you live in a dorm, sorority or fraternity, mark how many people you share your room with.)
- 1 - None or one other person
 - 2 - Two other people
 - 3 - Three other people
 - 4 - Four other people
 - 5 - Five or more other people

For questions 9 through 15, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 indicating total satisfaction and 1 indicating total dissatisfaction, in general how satisfied are you with each of the aspects of your dwelling listed below:

1	2	3	4	5
Totally				Totally
Dissatisfied				Satisfied

9. The space you have
10. The quality of your dwelling
11. The location of your dwelling
12. The amount of rent you pay
13. Maintenance of the property
14. Availability of parking
15. Your relationship with the landlord or management
16. What is your age category?
- 1 - Under 20
 - 2 - 20 through 22
 - 3 - 23 through 25
 - 4 - 26 through 35
 - 5 - 36 or over
17. What is your sex?
- 1 - Female
 - 2 - Male

18. What year are you in school?

- 1 - Freshman
- 2 - Sophomore
- 3 - Junior
- 4 - Senior
- 5 - Other

19. Are you currently:

- 1 - Single
- 2 - Married
- 3 - Separated
- 4 - Widow(er)
- 5 - Other

20. What is your citizenship?

- 1 - Citizen outside of U.S.
- 2 - Citizen of U.S.

21. Which of the categories below best describes your financial situation:

- 1 - Financially dependent on parents
- 2 - Financially dependent on spouse
- 3 - Financially independent
- 4 - Earn part of own money, part from parents
- 5 - Earn part of own money, part from spouse

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albertus, A.D.; Dustin, Richard, and Snider, Bill. "Advantages of Off-Campus Living." The Journal of College and University Student Housing 8 (Summer 1978):18.
- Alfert, E. "Developmental Stages and Choice of Residence in College." The Journal of College Student Personnel 9 (1968):90-93.
- Antes, Richard L. "A Study of Freshmen Student Expectation and Satisfaction with the Privately Owned Off-Campus Residence Hall Environment at Southern Illinois University." Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1971.
- Ardyce, Mary G. "Student Academic Performance as Influenced by On-Campus and Off-Campus Residence." Ph.D. dissertation, Oregon State University, 1968.
- Astin, Alexander W. "The Impact of Dormitory Living on Students." Educational Record 54 (Summer 1973):204-210.
- Babbie, Earl. The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishers, 1975.
- Betz, E.L.; Klingensmith, J.E., and Menne, J.W. "The Measurement and Analysis of College Student Satisfaction." Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance 3 (Summer 1970):110-118.
- Betz, E.L.; Starr, A.M., and Menne, J.W. "College Student Satisfaction in Ten Public and Private Colleges and Universities." The Journal of College Student Personnel 13 (September 1972):456-461.
- Brothers, Joan and Hatch, Stephen. Residence and Student Life: A Sociological Inquiry into Residence in Higher Education. London: Tavistock Publishers, 1971.
- Bryan, M.E. "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Academic Achievement and Five Dimensions of Satisfaction with the College Environment." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1977.
- Canter, David and Thorne, Ross. "Attitudes to Housing: A Cross-Cultural Comparison." Environment and Behavior 4 (March 1972):3-32.
- Carson, Daniel H. "The Interactions of Man and His Environment." in School Environment Research: Environmental Evaluations 2 pp. 13-15. A Publication of the Architectural Research Laboratory, Department of Architecture. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1965.
- Center for Research on Language and Language Behavior. Research Conference on Social Science Methods and Student Residences. By John H. Taylor and Harlan L. Lane, Project Directors. Project Number F-031. University of Michigan, 1965.

- Chickering, Arthur W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1969.
- Clark, W.A.A. and Cadwallader, M. "Locational Stress and Residential Mobility." Environment and Behavior 5 (March 1973):29-41.
- Coan, Clark. A Survey of the Housing of Foreign Students at the University of Kansas. Lawrence: International Student Studies, 1966.
- "Description of the Current Research on Housing." The Chronicle of Higher Education 6 (March 1972):9.
- DiRuzza, Richard M. "An Analysis of College Student Satisfaction at Baldwin-Wallace College Using Various Residential and Non-Residential Groupings." Ph.D. dissertation, Kent State University, 1978.
- Draper, L.H. "The Housing of Foreign Students." The Journal of Higher Education 24 (January 1953):35-38.
- DuBois, Cora A. Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956.
- Educational Facilities Laboratories. Housing for New Types of Students. New York: Educational Facilities Laboratories, 1977.
- Finley, Murray H. "Assessing the Relationship Between Student Environment Fit and Academic Success and Satisfaction for Nine Iowa Four Year Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1971.
- Freedman, Jonathan L. Crowding and Behavior. New York: Viking Press, 1975.
- Frichette, Steven R. "Factors Associated with the Social Climate of Single-Sex and Coeducational Residence Halls, Cooperatives, Fraternities and Sororities on the OSU Campus." Ph.D. dissertation, Oregon State University, 1976.
- Gallo, Dennis C. "Student Perceived Aspects of the SIUC Environment." Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1977.
- Gans, Herbert J. The Levittowners: Ways of Life and Politics in a New Suburban Community. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.
- Garrett, Henry E. Elementary Statistics. 2nd ed. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1962.
- Gehring, Donald D. "Legal Trends and Developments in College Housing." The Journal of College and University Student Housing 4 (Summer 1974):5-8.

Goldsmith, H.D. "The Relationship Between Selected Factors in the Residence Hall Environment and Resident's Perceptions of that Environment." The Journal of College and University Student Housing 5 (Winter 1975-76):30-32.

Hallenbeck, D.A. and Balswick, J.K. "The Effects of Over-occupancy on Resident Hall Satisfaction and Grade Point Averages." The Journal of College and University Student Housing 8 (Summer 1978): 19-23.

Hallenbeck, T.R. "College Student Satisfaction: An Indication of Institutional Vitality." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal 16 (Autumn 1978):19-25.

Harrington, T.F. "The Literature on the Commuter Student." The Journal of College Student Personnel 24 (November 1972):546-550.

Himes, Harold H. "Space as a Component of Environment." in School Environment Research: Environmental Evaluations 2 pp. 53-71. A Publication of the Architectural Research Laboratory, Department of Architecture. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1965.

Institute of International Education. Open Doors 1975: Report on International Educational Exchange. New York: Institute of International Education, 1976.

Kasraian, Abbas. "Adaptation Processes Utilized by Foreign Students in Coping with Academic Programs and Procedures in American Colleges and Universities." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1978.

Klecka, William R.; Nie, Norman H., and Hull, C. Hadlai. SPSS Primer. New York: McGraw-Hill, Incorporated, 1975.

KSU Computing Center. Grader Users Guide. Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, 1976.

Lazersfeld, Paul. Forward to Survey Design and Analysis, by Herbert Hyman. New York: The Free Press, 1955.

Lowenthal, David. "Research in Environmental Perception and Behavior: Perspectives on Current Problems." Environment and Behavior 4 (September 1972):333-342.

Madson, D.L.; Kuder, J.M., and Thompson, T.T. "How Satisfied are Your Residents? A Longitudinal Report." The Journal of College and University Student Housing 4 (Summer 1974):9-14.

Michelson, William. Environmental Choice, Human Behavior, and Residential Satisfaction. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

- Miller, Theodore K. and Prince, Judith S. The Future of Student Affairs: A Guide to Student Development for Tomorrow's Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.
- Morris, Earl W.; Crull, Sue R., and Winter, Mary. "Housing Norms, Housing Satisfaction and the Propensity to Move." Journal of Marriage and the Family 38 (May 1976):309-320.
- Morris, Earl W. and Winter, Mary. Housing, Family and Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. Housing of Foreign Students: Guidelines. Cleveland, Ohio: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 017 030, 1967.
- Nie, Norman H.; Hull, C. Hadlai; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin, and Bent, Dale H. SPSS. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Incorporated, 1975.
- Packwood, William T. College Student Personnel Services. Springfield, Illinois: Chas. C. Thomas Publishers, 1977.
- Palmer, David A. "Student Perceptions of Residence Hall Environment at Michigan State University." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976.
- Parsons, Robert. Statistical Analysis: A Decision-Making Approach. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974.
- Perkins, K.A. "The Effect of Value Similarity on Satisfaction with College Residence Hall Living Groups." The Journal of College Student Personnel 18 (November 1977):491-495.
- Pope, H. Don. "National Married Housing Survey." Association of College and University Housing Officers News (March 1973):8-9.
- Prodosh, Aich. "Social Determinants for the Political Attitudes of African Students in German Speaking Countries." Soz-Psychol 18 (1966):482-515.
- Proshansky, Harold M.; Ittelson, William H., and Rivlin, LeAnne G., eds. Environmental Psychology: Man and His Physical Setting. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- Raven, J. "Sociological Evidence on Housing: the Home Environment." The Architectural Review 142:236-240.
- Riker, Harold C. and Lopez, Frank G. College Students Live Here. A Study of College Housing. New York: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 031-071, 1961.
- Rossi, Peter H. Why Families Move. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

- Sanford, N. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1967.
- Schmidt, DuMont K. and Sedlacek, William E. "Variables Related to University Student Satisfaction." The Journal of College Student Personnel 13 (May 1972):233-238.
- Selby, T.J. and Weston, K.F. "Dormitory Versus Apartment Housing for Freshmen." The Journal of College Student Personnel 19 (March 1978):153-157.
- Sinnett, E.R.; Sackman, A.D., and Eddy, G. "The Influence of Living Unit on the Behavior of College Students." The Journal of College Student Personnel 13 (May 1972):209-214.
- Spaulding, Seth and Flack, Michael J. The World's Students in the United States: A Review and Evaluation of Research on Foreign Students. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976.
- Speare, Alden. "Residential Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in Residential Mobility." Demography 11 (May 1974):173-188.
- Sturtz, S.A. "Age Differences in College Student Satisfaction." The Journal of College Student Personnel 12 (May 1971):220-222.
- Sukoff, Albert and Fink, Ira S. Living On-Campus/Living Off-Campus: Changes in Student Housing Patterns. Berkeley: University of California Systemwide Administration, 1976.
- Tautfest, P.B. and Townsend, Deborah. "Housing Selected by Senior Women and Academic Aptitude, Achievement and Progress." The Journal of College Student Personnel 9 (March 1968):94-96.
- Titus, Chester R. "Student Perceptions of Important Factors in Single Student Housing." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.
- _____. "Students Express Their Housing Needs and Preferences." The Journal of College Student Personnel 13 (May 1972):202-204.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Social Indicators, 1976. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Housing Reports. Series H-150-76, General Housing Characteristics for the United States and Regions, Annual Housing Survey: 1976, Part A. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Housing Reports. Series H-150-76, Indicators of Housing and Neighborhood Quality for the United States and Regions, Annual Housing Survey: 1976, Part B. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.

- U.S. Department of Commerce. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports. Series P-20, Living Arrangements of College Students: October 1971, no. 245. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports. Series P-23, Characteristics of American Youth: 1970, no. 34. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.
- U.S. Department of Labor. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Special Labor Force Report. Number 204, Going Back to School at 35 and Over. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.
- Valentine, Robert K. "A Study of Student Opinion of Residence Hall Living at the University of Southern Mississippi." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1976.
- Welty, John. D. "The Impact of the Residence Hall, Off-Campus and Commuter Living Situations on College Freshmen." Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1974.
- Whitney, Vincent H. and Grigg, Charles M. "Patterns of Mobility Among A Group of Families of College Students." American Sociological Review 23 (December 1958):643-652.
- Wills, B.S. "The Relationship Between Level of Self-actualization and Dissatisfaction with Selected Living Arrangements." The Journal of College and University Student Housing 4 (Summer 1974):15-18.
- _____. "Variables Related to Satisfaction with College Housing." The Journal of College and University Student Housing 5 (Summer 1975):5-8.
- Wynd, W.R. "Student Attitudes Toward Dormitory Living." The Journal of College and University Student Housing 3 (Fall 1973):8-12.

HOUSING SATISFACTION
AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

by

MELANIE ROWE STOCKDELL
B.A., University of Colorado, 1975

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family Economics

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1979

AN ABSTRACT

There currently exists very little research which addresses itself to satisfaction among students with their various housing arrangements. The purpose of this study is to determine how satisfied students are with their living situations in terms of space, quality, location of the dwelling, housing expenditure, maintenance, availability of parking and relationship with the landlord. In addition, the study sought to determine the influence which the following variables had on satisfaction with the measured aspects of housing as well as on total housing satisfaction: age, gender, marital status, duration of occupancy, tenure, level of crowding, student classification, type of housing, on or off-campus location, citizenship, housing expenditure, and distance from campus.

Data used for this study were the questionnaire responses of 9,271 students attending Kansas State University, Manhattan during the spring semester, 1979. That figure represented over half of the student population.

Frequency distributions were computed for all of the variables in order to determine the overall characteristics of the sample. Crosstabulations using chi square analysis were used to determine the level of significance of relationships, and where appropriate Kendall's Tau b or Tau c was used to measure the strength and direction of associations.

Multiple regressions were incorporated to determine the partial influences of variables on total satisfaction. F values were calculated for the individual regression coefficients and R^2 was utilized to determine the proportions of variance attributable to the independent variables.

The findings indicated, among other things, that age, student classification, citizenship, duration of occupancy, on or off-campus location and type of housing were significantly related to satisfaction with housing. There were positive relationships between different aspects of housing and age, student classification, and duration of occupancy, and negative relationships between housing satisfaction and expenditure and level of crowding. Off-campus students exhibited significantly higher levels of satisfaction, while on-campus residents were dissatisfied with nearly every aspect of their housing situation. Foreign students displayed lower levels of satisfaction with all aspects of their housing than did American students.